

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are currently pending in the present application, with claims 1 and 7-8 being written in independent form. Claims 1-2, 11, and 13 have been amended for clarity. Claims 7-8 have been withdrawn from consideration. New claims 19-20 have also been added. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the originally-filed application. Thus, no new matter has been introduced into the claims.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection has been rendered moot by the present amendments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the above rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102/103 (Bokova)

Claims 1-6 and 9-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by "*Laser-Induced Effects in Raman Spectra of Single-Wall Carbon Nanotubes*," Quantum Electronics (July 31, 2003), Vol. 33, No. 7, pp. 645-650 (Bokova) or alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Bokova. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons below.

This rejection has been rendered moot by the present amendments. Bokova fails to disclose or suggest the method of amended claim 1.

For at least the reasons above, there can be no anticipation with regard to claim 1. Consequently, there can also be no anticipation with regard to claims 2-6 and 9-

18, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the above rejection.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (Yudasaka + Howard + Bokova)

Claims 1-6 and 9-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over “*Diameter-Selective Removal of Single-Wall Carbon Nanotubes Through Light-Assisted Oxidation*,” Chemical Physics Letters (June 4, 2003), Vol. 374, Issues 1-2, pp. 132-136 (Yudasaka) in view of US 7,396,520 (Howard) and Bokova. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons below.

This rejection has been rendered moot by the present amendments. The combination of Yudasaka, Howard, and Bokova fails to disclose or suggest the method of amended claim 1.

For at least the reasons above, a *prima facie* case of obviousness cannot be established with regard to claim 1. Consequently, a *prima facie* case of obviousness also cannot be established with regard to claims 2-6 and 9-18, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the above rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of all the pending claims in the present application.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

DJD/ACC:vrj
Acc